

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

ANGELA HALL,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.	)	
	)	FILE No. 5:21-cv-1056
ABERFELDY LTD PARTNERSHIP,	)	
d/b/a ALAMO HILLS PLAZA,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW, ANGELA HALL, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, her Complaint against Defendant LECO BROADWAY 410. LLC, d/b/a ALAMO HILLS PLAZA, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows the Court as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. The Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendant’s failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

**PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff ANGELA HALL (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in San Antonio, Texas

(Bexar County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. Plaintiff is also an independent advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of asserting her civil rights, monitoring, ensuring, and determining whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. Her motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others, and pledges to do whatever is necessary to create the requisite standing to confer jurisdiction upon the Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on the Property, including returning to the Property as soon as it is accessible (“Advocacy Purposes”).”

7. Defendant ABERFELDY LTD PARTNERSHIP d/b/a ALAMO HILLS PLAZA (hereinafter “ALAMO HILLS PLAZA”) is a for profit Texas Limited Partnership that transacts business in the state of Texas and within the judicial district.

8. ALAMO HILLS PLAZA may be properly served with process through its registered agent, to wit: CT CORP SYSTEM, 350 N. St. Paul Street, Dallas, Texas 75021.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

9. On or about August 14, 2021, Plaintiff was a customer at “Shipley Do-Nuts” a business located at 1246 Austin Highway, San Antonio, Texas 78209, referenced herein as the “Shipley Do-Nuts.”

10. ALAMO HILLS PLAZA is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that the Shipley’s Do-Nuts is situated upon and that is the subject of the action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

11. Plaintiff lives approximately 8 miles from the Shipley’s Do-Nuts and Property.

12. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located at 1240 Austin Highway, San Antonio, Bexar County Property Identification numbers 420935 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of her disabilities, and she will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendant is compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Shipley’s Do-Nuts and Property, including those set forth in her Complaint.

13. Plaintiff has visited the Property at least once before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property within six months or sooner, as soon as the barriers to access detailed in her Complaint are removed and the Property is accessible again. The purpose of the revisit is to be a regular customer, to determine if and when the Property is made accessible and to maintain standing for her lawsuit for Advocacy Purposes.

14. Plaintiff intends to revisit the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property to purchase goods and/or services.

15. Plaintiff travelled to the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, encountered the barriers to access at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property that are detailed in her Complaint, engaged those barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG**

16. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

17. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and the number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the

discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and

- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

18. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

\* \* \* \* \*

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

19. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

20. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

21. The Shipley's Do-Nuts is a public accommodation and service establishment.

22. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

23. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

24. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

25. The Shipley's Do-Nuts must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

26. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

27. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Shipley's Do-Nuts and the Property in her capacity as a customer of the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property and as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of her disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property that preclude and/or limit her access to the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in her Complaint.

28. Plaintiff intends to visit the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property again in the very near future as a customer in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property and as an independent advocate for the disabled, but will be unable to fully do so because of her disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property that preclude and/or limit her access to the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in her Complaint.

29. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying her access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

30. Defendant will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendant is compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

31. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed that precluded and/or

limited Plaintiff's access to the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property include, but are not limited to:

**ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:**

- (i) In front of Shipley Do-Nuts, the two accessible parking spaces have a vertical rise in excess of ¼ inch and is in violation of Sections 303.2 and 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as well as make it difficult for Plaintiff to travel to the public accommodations offered at the Property as the vertical rise could cause the tire of the wheelchair to get snagged or impede movement.
- (ii) In front of Shipley Do-Nuts, there are two accessible parking spaces that are missing identification signs in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- (iii) In front of Shipley Do-Nuts, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.
- (iv) In front of Shipley Do-Nuts, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and



difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.

(v) In front of Shipley Do-Nuts, the Property has an accessible ramp leading from the accessible parking space to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because when ramps are too steep (more than 1:12) it requires too much physical arm strain to wheel up the ramp and increases the likelihood of the wheelchair falling backwards and Plaintiff being injured.

(vi) In front of Shipley Do-Nuts, the accessible ramp side flares have a slope in excess of 1:10 in violation of section 406.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because steep slopes on ramp side flares could cause the wheelchair to tip over and injure Plaintiff.

(vii) In front of Shipley Do-Nuts, there is a vertical rise at the top of the accessible ramp that is in excess of a  $\frac{1}{4}$  of an inch, in violation of Section 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property when using this accessible ramp as vertical rises on ramps are particularly dangerous as the surface of the ramp is already at a significant slope which increases the likelihood of the wheelchair to tip over due to the vertical rise.

(viii) Near Verizon and Papa John's, due to an inadequate policy of parking lot maintenance or a lack thereof, two accessible parking spaces are not adequately

marked so as to adequately gauge the width of accessible parking spaces and the presence of an access aisle and is therefore in violation of Section 502.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space and may cause other vehicles to unknowingly park in the accessible parking space decreasing the available width to Plaintiff.

(ix) There is a policy of placing parking stops in the access aisles at the Property.

Specifically, there is a parking stop located in the access aisle of the accessible parking space nearest the Verizon and Papa John's which improperly encourages parking in the access aisle in violation of section 502.3.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to leave a vehicle when parked in this accessible parking space as it is probable a vehicle may be parked in the access aisle due to the encouragement of parking there.

(x) Near Verizon and Papa John's, there are two accessible parking spaces that are missing identification signs in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

(xi) In front of Papa John's, due to a policy of placing a table and sign in the accessible route, there are publically accessible areas of the Property having accessible routes with clear widths below the minimum 36 (thirty-six) inch requirement as required by section 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the rest of the units of the Property as Plaintiff's wheelchair would not be able to get past this barrier.

- (xii) Near Verizon and Papa John's, due to the placement of the parking stop in the access aisle as well as the placement of the table and sign, the Property lacks an accessible route connecting accessible facilities, accessible elements and/or accessible spaces of the Property in violation of section 206.2.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.
- (xiii) Near Verizon and Papa John's, due to the placement of the parking stop in the access aisle, the Property lacks an accessible route from the accessible parking space to the accessible entrance of the Property in violation of section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property from these accessible parking spaces as the far location increases the likelihood of traversing into the vehicular way and getting struck by a vehicle or encountering a barrier to access which stops Plaintiff from accessing the public accommodations offered at the Property.
- (xiv) At the accessible entrances of Verizon and Papa John's, there is a doorway threshold with a vertical rise in excess of  $\frac{1}{2}$  (one half) inch and does not contain a bevel with a maximum slope of 1:2 in violation of section 404.2.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- (xv) Due to the barrier to access identified in (n), not all entrance doors and doorways comply with section 404 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, this is a violation of section 206.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the interior of the Property at this location as the vertical rise at the door threshold could potentially cause Plaintiff to tip over when

attempting to enter. Moreover, this barrier to access is made more difficult by the fact that it is in the doorway and Plaintiff would be required to hold the door open with one hand while attempt to the “push” the wheel of the wheelchair over the vertical rise.

(xvi) In front of Unit 208, the access aisle to the accessible parking space is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.

(xvii) In front of Unit 208, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking space in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.

(xviii) In front of Unit 208, the accessible parking spaces are not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the accessible parking spaces in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle. Moreover, when the vehicle parks in this space, the vehicle blocks the accessible route to the ramp.

(xix) In front of Unit 208, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the accessible parking spaces in violation of section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG

Standards. This violation would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to exit/enter their vehicle.

(xx) In front of Unit 217, the access aisle adjacent to the accessible parking spaces has a slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards and are not level. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.

(xxi) In front of Unit 217, there is a vertical rise at the base of the accessible ramp that is in excess of a ¼ of an inch, in violation of Section 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property when using this accessible ramp as vertical rises on ramps are particularly dangerous as the surface of the ramp is already at a significant slope which increases the likelihood of the wheelchair to tip over due to the vertical rise.

(xxii) In front of Unit 217, the Property has an accessible ramp leading from the accessible parking space to the accessible entrances with a slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because when ramps are too steep (more than 1:12) it requires too much physical arm strain to wheel up the ramp and increases the likelihood of the wheelchair falling backwards and Plaintiff being injured.

(xxiii) From Unit 200 and directly in front of Gold's Gym, the walking surfaces of the accessible route have a slope in excess of 1:20 in violation of section 403.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation would make it dangerous and difficult for

Plaintiff to access the units of the Property. As the accessible route is in excess of 1:20, it is considered an accessible ramp, moreover, it has a total rise greater than six (6) inches, yet does not have handrails in compliance with section 505 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, this is a violation of section 405.8 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.

(xxiv) Defendants fail to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

32. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property.

33. Plaintiff requires an inspection of Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property in violation of the ADA.

34. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

35. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to bring the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property into compliance with the ADA.

36. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property is readily

achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

37. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property is readily achievable because Defendants have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications.

38. Upon information and good faith belief, the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property have been altered since 2010.

39. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

40. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendant is required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property, including those alleged herein.

41. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

42. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendant.

43. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendant pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

44. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), the Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendant to

modify the Shipley's Do-Nuts and Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Shipley's Do-Nuts in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendant to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the subject Shipley's Do-Nuts to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff her reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: October 28, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Dennis R. Kurz

Dennis R. Kurz

*Attorney-in-Charge for Plaintiff*

Texas State Bar ID No. 24068183

Kurz Law Group, LLC

4355 Cobb Parkway, Suite J-285

Atlanta, GA 30339

Tele: (404) 805-2494

Fax: (770) 428-5356

Email: [dennis@kurzlawgroup.com](mailto:dennis@kurzlawgroup.com)